

CONTENTS OF THIS ISSUE:

Librarians' Caucus.....p.3	UCSD Librarians form a group to consider and act on special problems of librarians.
Resolutions on Chile	
In AFT and Labor.....3	Local 2034 takes resolution to AFT Council and Central Labor Council.
In Academic Senate.....4	AFT urges support at Oct. 23 Senate meet.
Chancellor's Memo on	
Freshman Seminar.....2	Our analysis.
Increasing Tuition in Higher Education.....5	
UC Growth Plans.....6	
Administration Salary Increases.....4	
UCSD AND LAND DEVELOPMENT PLANS.....7	
New Membership List.....8	

SHORT ANNOUNCEMENTS

United Farmworkers: The National AFT has committed itself to aid Chavez' Union in its struggles with growers and Teamsters. The Steering Committee of our local has decided to show our solidarity with the Farmworkers by providing four members to picket the Encinitas Safeway on Saturday afternoons from 2 to 6. All members are urged to participate. If you do not contact Bruce Johnson, ext. 2421, about when you can picket, he will be contacting you.

Evyonne: Ms. Evyonne Schulz, wife of one of the most active AFT delegates to the Central Labor Council, is running for San Diego City Council in the coming elections. She has a very good chance of winning, but urgently needs precinct workers. Please contact Fred Loncier, ext. 1974, if you can donate either money or time.

Proposition #1: The AFT opposes Proposition #1 concerning the tax system on the November ballot because it would severely curtail state governmental expenditures, including those for education.

Discussion Meetings on Goals: Meetings to determine the long-range goals and concrete projects of our Local are being held every two weeks. Projects under discussion at the moment include a series of public forums on education, investigation of UCSD decisions and procedures for reaching them concerning land development around the campus, and the issue of secret files and confidentiality in faculty hiring and promotion. If you want AFT action in the future to represent you, come to the next meeting at 8 p.m., Tuesday, Oct. 30, at 332 Prospect Street, Apt. D, La Jolla (home of Susan Kirkpatrick).

Friday Frolic: The Steering Committee has been dedicating much time to research on the subject of a bar close to the University where AFT members might meet at 5 pm. on Fridays to engage in serious discussion and other activities. Choice for this Friday (Oct. 19 and 26) is the Rheinlander Bar in La Jolla Shores on Avenida de la Playa. See you there at 5 pm, and if there are better suggestions, we'll change.

PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY AND THE CHANCELLOR'S

CONCERN FOR FRESHMEN

In public service work, professional commitment to service is frequently used to dissuade us from seeking to at least maintain our relative level of well-being. Hospital workers have no right to defend themselves at the cost of their patients; social workers at the cost of their "clients;" teachers at the cost of their students. When we teachers concern ourselves with bread and butter issues of salaries and working conditions, the response of administrators is to demand that we honor our "professional responsibility." This demand boils down, however, to an attempt to get more work out of us for the least pay, rather than a real concern with improving the quality of education.

We introduce these observations as the context in which to view a current notice of our Chancellor regarding greater faculty contact with freshmen students. (Memo to All Officers of Instruction, July 5, 1973) We share his concern with education, but disagree with the means he proposes to deal with it. If this institution is seriously to be committed to teaching as a major function of higher education, then it must begin to translate this into all aspects of its operation, from student participation in policy-making to hiring and up-grading faculty committed to more than advancing their individual careers through massive publication efforts. If the Chancellor is truly interested in "a more satisfactory freshman academic introduction to this university," he might do better to consult the freshmen than to propose his own solutions to "the problem."

But what are in fact his views on this matter? What do they imply for the future of higher education at UCSD? Why, for example, his particular concern for the "very good" students with an "enthusiasm for the subject?" Why not for the less motivated, "poorer" students who may need something they haven't previously experienced, a lack that may account in part for the poorer performance and/or non-enthusiasm for a subject? He wants to provide "some freshmen" with the added educational impact of "a first-hand experience with a scholar describing, in lay terms, the excitement of his (sic) research interests." Perhaps this is a good idea. But is this what freshmen (some? which?) want, or need? Are all or most of our scholars adept at communicating this excitement? Was that what they were hired for? Is that what they will be, or think they will be rewarded for?

And given the freshmen's full schedule of large, required courses, will they have time for these additional seminars? Might not such effort rather go to limiting the size or dullness of many of our introductory courses? Or to exploring the validity of requiring any such courses? Or to seeking improved balance between those who teach in addition to all other tasks, and those who are primarily hired as grant writers and research managers? Rather than investigating what is wrong with our teaching mission and the campus' learning environment--one which seems incapable of exciting the majority of students--the Chancellor's proposal is to simply add another piece to the already overloaded, and to many, unsavory pie. And it is accomplished by adding to work loads (a sixth course--a freshman seminar--every two years) with no alternative compensation, drawing on the professional mystique of "public service."

The only way that such good will will ever truly be tapped is to place the initiative, the responsibility and the authority for such efforts in the hands of those charged with performing and participating in that function. Toward that end, our Local of the AFT would welcome efforts to initiate an inquiry into what is wrong with our current academic program and the learning environment on this campus, and to seek means, with whoever among students, staff and faculty are willing to join us in this effort, for overcoming this institutional problem.

* * * * *

LIBRARY UNION CAUCUS

The new grievance procedures for academic non-Senata employees, Section 191 of the Administrative Manual, again points to the need for a strong organization of librarians to grapple with this and other issues. AFT librarians met on October 8 to form a caucus which will act as a catalyst within the library to effect needed changes. At this meeting, the librarians identified ten problems which they believe can be improved by the collective effort of both union and non-union library employees.

The issues discussed were:

1. Section 191--the need for an equitable grievance procedure.
2. Affirmative action--hiring and promotional practices for librarians and library assistants.
3. Opportunities for further education.
4. Part-time positions.
5. Reducing the work week if salaries are not increased.
6. Pay Differential for night and weekend work. Also overtime pay as a possible solution for problems in increasing the cataloging production.
7. Back pay for part-time employees who were illegally denied merit increases for three years.
8. More training within the library; exploration of the possibilities of more job exchanges or rotations.
9. Low use of the Central Library at night, compounded by the need for better personal security in this isolated area. Perhaps a solution is some form of transportation between dorms, parking lots, and the library.
10. Greater participation of front-line librarians in the governance of the library and the university.

Three issues seemed the most pressing: the need for security and transportation to the Central Library (what good is this major research library if people won't use it?); action to modify the inequalities in Section 191; and a review of affirmative action within the library during the past three years.

The librarians will meet again on October 23 at 6:30 p.m. Any library employees interested in attending should contact Marco Sassé, ext. 1971, or Virginia Sherwood, ext. 1951.

LABOR COUNCILS' RESOLUTIONS AGAINST THE CHILE JUNTA

A delegation from this local presented the following resolutions at a meeting of the San Diego and Imperial County AFT Council on October 3:

WHEREAS terror and political repression have been reliably reported as widespread throughout Chile in the wake of that country's recent coup d'etat; WHEREAS the military dictatorship has abolished all labor unions in Chile, with workers being forced to work at gunpoint in some instances; WHEREAS the democratically elected Rectors of the seven campuses of the University of Chile have been dismissed, to be replaced by military administrators; WHEREAS incidents of book-burning have taken place, as well as the suppression of all newspapers opposed to the dictatorship, and WHEREAS illegal incarcerations and summary executions of students, faculty, workers and others opposed to the dictatorship have also been reported; THEREFORE, be it resolved that this Local's Executive Committee urges all fraternal locals and members of trade unions to protest these grave violations of basic human rights; calls for immediate Congressional investigation into possible American involvement in the violent overthrow of a democratically elected government; Calls for organization of trade unionists to conduct an immediate on-site investigation into the status of Chilean trade unions and trade union members, urges all supporting locals to take this resolution to its membership for discussion and further appropriate action before the San Diego-Imperial County Central Labor Council, and urges that the widest possible publicity be given these actions through the media.

(continued)

RESOLUTIONS AGAINST THE CHILE JUNTA (cont.)

Local 2034 delegates, Carlos Blanco, Susan Kirkpatrick and Fred Lonicier, suggested that those present at the meeting take this resolution back to their own local for discussion. If the resolution were approved, each local could urge that it be presented and passed at the October meeting of the Central Labor Council. Subsequently, the AFT locals with whom Fred has checked have had favorable reactions to the resolution and are willing to support it at the Central Council.

Similar resolutions have been passed at Central Labor Councils around the state. The Alameda County Central Labor Council passed a resolution calling for an official delegation of labor representatives to observe treatment in Chile of imprisoned labor leaders and rank-and-file. The Santa Clara County Council expressed its opposition to the military coup and urged the Nixon administration to refuse all assistance to the junta. David Jenkins of the Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union asked the members of Local 10 not to handle cargo from Chile.

UNIVERSITY SENATE RESOLUTION AGAINST CHILE JUNTA

Our steering committee supports the resolution concerning events in Chile which has been placed on the agenda of the Academic Senate meeting scheduled for October 23. The text of the resolution, which can be found on page five of the 'Notice of Meeting,' condemns the Junta's violation of academic freedom at the University of Chile, as well as the violation of basic human rights of all Chilean citizens, and calls for a University of California policy to provide asylum for faculty and student refugees, for a Congressional investigation of possible U.S. involvement, and for the UCSD Faculty to protest individually and collectively against the political terror in Chile.

We urge all AFT members to attend the October 23 meeting where this resolution will be discussed and voted on.

* *****
* INCREASE IN ADMINISTRATION SALARIES---NEWS RELEASE FROM UNIVERSITY COUNCIL *
* *
* The University of California has raised administration salaries far *
* above the increase to all other University employees in 1973. *
* *
* The AFT in the October, 1973, issue of the University Guardian *
* released the administrative pay increases adopted at the July, 1973, *
* meeting of the Regents. These salary increases are adopted in secret *
* Regents' sessions. Administrative salaries in general went up by 8 to *
* 11 percent in July, 1973. Faculty and academic pay rose by 5.4 percent *
* and non-academic employee's pay by 5.5 percent. Over a 2-year period, *
* these same administrative salaries went up by more than 20 percent. In *
* some instances, the pay increased by 40 to 50 percent. *
* *
* Professor Spencer Olin, Peresident of the AFT University Council and *
* an historian at UC Irvine, stated, "It's bad enough that the UC Admini- *
* stration is top-heavy with unnecessary administrators, but it is even *
* worse that in a period of tight budgets, resources are generously lavished *
* on top management." Olin also noted that the pay boost for sixty-three *
* administrators totals \$128, 400 at a time when the University is proposing *
* to dismiss twenty to thirty professors at UCR who represent total yearly *
* salary expenditures of about \$250,000-\$300,000. *
* *****

CHILE AND NORTH-AMERICAN LABOR

Ruth Needleman of the North American Congress on Latin America spoke to members of the AFT on Wednesday, October 10, concerning the connection between the AFL and the American Institute of Free Labor Development, which was deeply involved in the strikes against President Allende of Chile last summer. Copies of a short paper by Needleman about the connections between the U.S. government, the AIFLD, and right-wing elements in Chile are available from the steering committee. Any AFT members who would be interested in working on a project to get more information on this area, in which research is very much needed, should contact Susan Kirkpatrick, ext. 2006.

A Powerful Force

One major effect of such a change—and a principal reason for the controversy surrounding the idea—would be to narrow the tuition gap between private and public colleges, thus improving the competitive position of the private institutions.

The private-public tuition ratio is now about 4 to 1 nationally. The Carnegie Commission proposed this summer that it be cut, partly through higher public tuition, to 2½ to 1, roughly the level that obtained for many years.

The nonprofit Committee for Economic Development, whose

200 members are mainly executives of major corporations but include a smattering of educational leaders, has been a powerful force in the nation's economic affairs since its founding in 1942. Its periodic "statements on national policy" have included several dealing with education, one of them a 1971 call for financing reforms designed to aid inner-city schools.

The latest, entitled "The Management and Financing of Colleges," plunges the committee into an increasingly sharp argument that has social, economic and political implications.

The dispute centers on the social vs. individual benefits of higher education, and the corresponding question of whether the public or the individual should pay the greater share of its costs.

And, although the committee's report does not stress the issue, the dispute inevitably involves the competition between private and public colleges and the issue of public aid in any form to the private institutions.

Specific Recommendations

The report was presented at a news conference here last week with a press embargo until today. It was attacked immediately and in the interim by public-college groups and others.

The statement's specific recommendations include the following:

¶An increase in tuition and fees at public colleges to 50 per cent of the cost of instruction per student. The charges now cover less than a fourth of the cost nationally, with the rest coming from state subsidies. The percentage at private colleges, according to the report, is more than 60.

¶Emphasis in both Federal and state funding on grants directly to students according to need, financed in part by the higher tuition charges, with some continuing general-purpose support to institutions at the state level and aid in special categories from the Federal Government.

¶An expanded, federally op-

erated student loan system. This would benefit middle- and upper-income families, who would be required to pay a greater share of their public-college costs but would be excluded from grants based on need.

The committee's statement covers a wide range of problem areas in undergraduate education, from fiscal planning to decision-making procedures to the role of students in shaping policy.

Main Arguments

But the tuition proposal seemed certain to attract the most attention and argument. As the report put it:

"The committee is fully aware of the controversial nature, particularly within the academic community, of any recommendation to raise the tuitions of public institutions to approximately 50 per cent of instructional costs."

The committee's main arguments for financing shifts are social. The present low-tuition structure at public institutions, it maintains, amounts to governmental subsidy of middle-income and wealthy students who should be required to pay more, and thus a diversion of funds from those who are poorest.

The report acknowledges the benefits to society of higher education and says they justify some subsidy for most students. But it adds:

"Nevertheless, because of the benefits of education to the individual, we consider it appropriate for students and their families to pay as large a part of the cost as they can afford."

The report was presented at

a news conference in Washington's Sheraton-Carlton Hotel by W. D. Eberle, President Nixon's special representative for trade negotiations and chairman of the Committee for Economic Development subcommittee that conducted the college study; Alfred C. Neal, president of the committee, and Sterling M. McMurrin, dean of the graduate school of the University of Utah and the study's project director.

The three stressed that the increases in tuition recommended in the report should not go into effect until adequate grant and loan systems were in operation.

Mr. McMurrin, a former United States Commissioner of Education, disagreed with the tuition-increase part of the report because of its heavy reliance on loans for students not poor enough to qualify for outright grants.

"I'm concerned that this views of a few multibillion-dollar corporations and affluent private universities," Allan W. Ostar, the association's executive director, declared:

"The only way most middle-income students could go to college under the C.E.D. plan would be to borrow very large sums and take on enormous long-term debts."

Calvin Lee, chancellor of the University of Maryland-Baltimore County, said at the news conference that dependence on loans was a risky proposition at best in view of recent experience with a tight money market.

Alluding to the public-private college controversy, he said of proposals such as those made by the committee, "In order to make sirloin more at-

tractive, they want to raise the price of chuck."

At the same session, statements attacking the committee's proposals were issued on behalf of the National Student Lobby and the National Association of Junior and Community Colleges.

The education department of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations has prepared a response to the committee's recommendations that says they "add up to a plan that would shatter the educational hopes of workers and their families."

Support for the proposal came from the Association of American Colleges, which represents 800 colleges and universities, most of them private.

Peter P. Muirhead, chief of the higher-education section of the Federal Office of Education, said the Government had no position on the question of increasing tuition at public colleges but was "completely in might create a situation where middle-income people will not be able to afford a college education," Mr. McMurrin said. "If loans are available in adequate amounts, that would be a different situation."

Potential Effects

At a news conference in the same hotel immediately after the committee's presentation, spokesmen for the American Association of State Colleges and Universities focused their criticism on the loan question and the potential effects on middle-class students.

Charging that "the C.E.D. report appears to express the accord" with recommendations that "put a great deal of emphasis on aid to students and freedom of choice."

In Massachusetts, where rapid expansion of the state university in the last decade has led to an often bitter confrontation with the state's private colleges, Peter B. Edelman, the state system's vice president for university policy, said efforts were being made to cool the dispute by increasing state aid to students.

Noting that the state's tuition charges had just been increased by \$50 to \$300 a year—still among the lowest in the country—he said: "What with the Carnegie report and now the C.E.D., I expect we'll be facing even more pressure to push the price up."

The cost of a single copy of the 104-page report is \$1.50 from the committee at 477 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. 10022.

PUBLIC COLLEGES URGED TO DOUBLE TUITION CHARGES

Influential Research Group
Wants Government's Aid
Focused on the Needy

By EVAN JENKINS

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Sept. 30—An influential business-oriented research group urged today that public colleges and universities more than double their undergraduate tuition charges.

The recommendation by the Committee for Economic Development adds a respected voice, in an intensifying national controversy, to the argument that government subsidies of higher education should not benefit all students equally but should be concentrated on those who demonstrate greatest need, even though one result is increased financial pressure on the middle class.

And at a time when both public and private colleges are in a cost squeeze and facing a leveling-off in enrollments, the committee also comes down on the side of those urging public measures to help private institutions survive.

Administration Policy

The committee's proposal for increased public tuition parallels recommendations made recently by such organizations and the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education and the College Entrance Examination Board. All three groups have coupled the proposal with calls for massive increases in aid to students, based on need.

The emphasis on more direct aid to individual students—who could use the money for public or private schooling—and less to institutions is also in line with the policy of the Nixon Administration on Federal aid to higher education.

Many observers believe the mounting pressure will lead to a basic restructuring of public tuition policy, in addition to the increases already occurring because of steadily rising costs.

Startling Shift in UC Growth Plans

Cal, UCLA Will Be the Only Large Campuses

By Carl Irving
Education Writer

The University of California, in a major shift, now plans to maintain only two large general campuses, at Berkeley and Los Angeles.

It will limit the other seven UC campuses both in size and subject matter.

The new goal, for a smaller and less comprehensive university, was inserted in the annual budget proposal to the UC regents last week in Los Angeles.

The university's biggest change of direction since the 1950s apparently was done quietly to avoid stirring up protests from Davis, Santa Cruz, Santa Barbara, Irvine, San Diego and Riverside.

Rumors had circulated for some time that UC would accede to proposals from Sacramento to draw up less ambitious growth plans. But this was the first time the administration of UC President Charles Hitch had made such plans public.

The seemingly bland budget report included some related new directions:

- Shifts in decision making from the campuses to the Berkeley statewide headquarters.
- Significant slackening of library growth everywhere and especially at the six newer campuses.
- A far smaller rate of expected growth through this decade and probably beyond.
- A more conciliatory tone toward Sacramento regarding financial support.

Not everyone in the university system was entirely happy with the new outlook. Dean McHenry, chancellor of the Santa Cruz campus, noted that the administrators there and at Irvine "are nervous, and we even have some misgivings."

McHenry proclaimed his loyalty to Hitch but added that "Santa Cruz cannot prosper without better balance. We need one or more professional schools. Some resources at Berkeley and Los Angeles may have to be transferred if we are to be full fledged, intact university units."

The growth goal of Santa Cruz has been scaled down from 27,500 to 7500 students. But at Irvine, a spokesman said its buildings, utilities, even the sewers, had been planned and built with 27,500 students in mind. These are the current totals at Berkeley and UCLA.

When Clark Kerr was president, before being fired in early 1967, UC had envisioned a dozen campuses providing academic riches for masses of young people.

But since 1970, when fees began going up (they now total more than \$600 a year), enrollments have leveled off. They totaled 100,000 in 1970, and are expected to total 108,000 this year.

The 19-campus State University system, which has almost no faculty research and lower admissions standards, has grown from 197,000 to 233,000 students during the same three-year period. Fees total about \$100 a year at the State University campuses.

The university's new static state is attributed primarily to dips in the birth rate, new interests among young people and economic slowdown.

Hitch told the regents last week, "In the past, enrollment growth and its corresponding resources provided the flexibility necessary to meet new and changing program needs."

Now, the report indicated, some programs may have to be pared, professors and plans shifted around, to make do with less money. In January, a new academic plan will be completed reflecting this point of view.

The plan was drawn up by a board headed by Hitch's chief deputy, C. O. McCorkle, a former dean of agriculture at Davis. McCorkle was aided by other members of Hitch's administration, faculty members and students.

A year and a half's survey has led to the conclusion that there must be "extensive flexibility in the use of faculty and staff positions within the total university . . ."

The regents laid the groundwork for this last spring when they approved plans for early retirements, greater use of temporary appointments, and encouraged voluntary transfers from one campus to another.

The budget report for the first time set up different faculty-student ratios for the campuses, 18 to 1, and 16.5 to 1 for Berkeley and Los Angeles. The campuses will get more or fewer professors, depending on what they teach, how fast they grow, and how many graduate students they have.

One of the most significant indicators in the budget requests involved the buying of books.

Los Angeles, Berkeley and San Francisco, for the first time, would be able to enlarge their libraries at a faster rate than the smaller campuses.

McHenry had strong criticism for the library policy. He called it "quite wrong . . . More ought to be done to make the great UC libraries more accessible to the smaller campuses."

McHenry noted that books have been piled up in a Richmond warehouse because the Berkeley campus had run out of room. But the books were unsorted, and thus unavailable to other campuses.

Still to be spelled out are the special study areas to be reserved for particular campuses. A good deal of infighting might be expected for new fields.

For instance, Santa Barbara apparently has given up on getting a law school but reportedly still hopes for professional programs in speech therapy, child development and business economics.

Davis is near its planned size and its administration is less concerned about new academic plans. But others, such as San Diego, join Santa Cruz in calling for shifts from the larger campuses, if necessary.

The Berkeley campus, which claims to have lost more than 300 faculty positions in recent years because of budget cuts, would resist such moves. Eighty-five percent of Berkeley's faculty has tenure.

Whatever else, the new UC direction apparently signifies an end to annual budget battles between the offices of Governor Reagan and President Hitch.

Concentrating on two large campuses and cutting back on growth plans is harmonious with proposals listed in extensive audits conducted by the Governor's staff.



SAFEMAY AND THE SOULEFUL UNIVERSITY

While only symbolic, the current plans to build a Safeway store adjacent to the University Campus with University approval reflect a number of this institution's limitations:

1. WHO DECIDES? A Campus Planning Committee (CPC) overwhelmed with administrators, accountable for the most part to the Regents and their personal preferences. Only two faculty are members by virtue of their chairmanship of the Academic Senate and the Committee on Educational Policy. And only one student.
2. WHAT IS DECIDED? Largely limited to issues of physical design and aesthetics, the CPC shies away from addressing social and economic issues felt to be beyond their scope of concern. The good offices of UCSD, a center of critical thinking, research and even occasionally action, withdraws itself from controversy, seeking the partisan calm of business as usual.
3. IS SAFEMAY IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF UCSD COMMUNITY?
 - a) Cal PIPCO found its prices to be among the higher range of those surveyed.
 - b) Safeway has a long history and numerous current cases in court challenging its claim of handling only high quality goods, as well as its monopoly pricing practices and its improper labeling of goods.
 - c) Its presence here would be an insult to all those involved with or concerned with the struggle of farm workers to organize to gain the rights and benefits most of us already have. It is an insult to specific student organizations (the Boycott Committee, FECHA, the Triton Times, the North Star, etc.) who have actively opposed Safeway's policies of denying the right to farm workers of free elections and of seeking to break their union. It is an insult to the membership of the AFT Local on this campus, representing over 10% of UCSD's faculty, and whose members have become increasingly active in Boycott efforts.
 - d) Its presence would contribute to a near monopoly situation for Safeway in this area, that chain being dominant within this region already.

WE CALL UPON THE MEMBERSHIP:

1. To join our Boycott support of the United Farm Workers on Saturday afternoons from 2 - 6. Contact Bruce Johnson ext. 2423.
2. Contact the Academic Senate Office (x. 2227) for information on the next meeting of either the University Community Forum (Nov. 1st, 7:30 pm, Sumner Auditorium) and/or the CPC, and attend those meetings to give support to the above-noted concerns.
3. Join the AFT Subcommittee on university planning. Contact Bob Weifetz, Urban and Rural Studies, x. 2814. Our concerns can range as widely (Fourth College, University Master Plan, student housing, the Extended University, the proposed second class status of all campuses in relation to UCLA and UCR, etc.) as members' interests and energies permit.

Name	Department	Address	Lxt.	Home Phone
Jaime Alazraki	Literature	4062 HSS	2006	459-7640
Richard Arneson	Philosophy	410 MC	2817	845-3648
Frank Tajic	Librarian	C. Lib.	1967	271-1168
Jeffrey Barnow (On leave, 1973-74)	Literature	5029		
Mario Barrera	Political Science	HSS	1763	277-6649
Carlos Blanco	Literature	410 MC	2817	459-5270
Nathalie Brom	Literature	4059 HSS	2006	755-7487
Abraham Dijkstra	Literature	1003 H-L	1226	755-3115
Pace DuTois	Literature	4009 HSS	2006	459-0093
Robert Edelman	History	5024 HSS	1763	
Mary Edzard's	Librarian	C. Lib.	1965	278-0967
John Elvson	Biology	4080 H-S	2537	755-3850
Edmund Fantino	Psychology	5123 P-L	2125	
Edwin Fussell	Literature	4024 HSS	2006	459-8769
Susan Galloway	Librarian	H-L Lib.	1971	
William Goff	Librarian	Sto Lib.	1982	753-3472
Frank Halpern	Physics	3414 PC	1845	453-0778
Robert Heifetz	Urban-Rural St.	411 MC	2814	459-2160
Bruce Johnson	Sociology	7005 HSS	2423	436-0683
Martin D. Kamen	Chemistry	3246 PE	1440	459-6145
Raymond Kelly	Lab Assistant	1208 H-S	2544	453-7892
Susan Kirkpatrick	Literature	4009 HSS	2006	459-7280
Susan Kleinberg	History	5024 HSS	1763	755-6537
Helen Longino	Philosophy	3154 H-L	1222	753-2718
Fred Lonidier	Visual Arts	402 MC	1974	755-7557
Oscar Lumpkin	Physics	5434 PC	1841	453-4359
Roy Orava	Mathematics	7250 AP-H	2450	
Gail Orvedt	Sociology	7001 HSS	2421	
Fred Randel (On leave, 1973-74)	Literature			
Mike Peal	Communications	411 MC	2405	459-7097
Robert Ritchie	History	5070 HSS	1763	755-8504
Robert Russell	Economics	3426 H-L	1603	755-4172
Daniel R. Sanborn	Librarian	Cent. Lib.	1969	
Rosaura Sanchez	Literature	410MC	2817	472-2854
Marro Sassé	Librarian	H-L Lib.	1971	755-6176
Ronald Scales	Philosophy	3112 H-L	1221	
Herbert Schiller (On leave, 1973-74)	Communications			
Virginia Sherwood	Librarian	Cent. Lib.	1985	755-2657
William Siembieda	Urban-Rural St.	411 MC	2813	278-1657
Phillip Smith	Librarian	Cent. Lib.	1961	278-4658
Saul Steier	Literature	4009 HSS	2006	454-7022
Philip Steinmetz	Visual Arts	402 MC	1995	
Robert Swanson	Physics	4306 PC	1882	
George Szanto (On leave, 73-74)	Literature			
Audrey Terras	Mathematics	7018 AP-H	2456	
Michael Todd	Visual Arts	402 MC	1995	
Ellen Van Fleete	Visual Arts	402 H-C	1995	
Wayne Vernon	Physics	3310 PC	1897	274-2157
Cynthia Walk	Literature	1037 H-L	1226	454-0593
John Waterhouse	Literature	508 MC	2820	296-6776
Robert Westerman	Librarian	Cent. Lib.	1962	
Kent Wilson	Chemistry	3262 UH	1473	755-3940
Donald Wesling (On leave, 1973-74)	Literature			
Jim White	Mathematics	7018 AP-H	2441	429-0087
Ulla Wohlleben	Librarian	Cent. Lib.	1967	755-8234
Paul Zarins	Librarian	Cent. Lib.	1962	459-7063

OFFICERS

President--Susan Kirkpatrick
 Vice-President--Marro Sassé
 Secretary-Treasurer--Fred Lonidier

Delegates at large: Carlos Blanco
 Robert Heifetz
 Oscar Lumpkin
 Virginia Sherwood